

**REMARKS**

Page 1 of the specification is amended to add the serial numbers of the related applications.

Claim 1 is amended in response to an indefiniteness rejection and claims 10-16 are amended to improve clarity. Claim 17 is amended to add the feature "wherein a level of trust associated with the indications depends upon a first condition of the one or more first conditions", which is supported by at least claim 1 as originally filed. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112****Claim 1**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for lack of antecedent basis. In response, claim 1 is amended to recite antecedent basis.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103****Claims 1-17 and 19-21**

Claims 1-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the reference "Decentralized Trust Management" (hereinafter "Blaze" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,467 (hereinafter Gong). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

receiving at least a second condition and a second element of evidence, wherein the second condition is associated with the permission set and a level of trust associated with the second element is dependent upon the first condition. (emphasis added)

1 The Office Action asserts that the "first condition" and the "first evidence"  
2 recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A's verifiable  
3 digital signature on B's key is the condition, and A's public/private key pair is  
4 evidence".

5 The Office Action also asserts that the "second condition" and the "second  
6 evidence" recited in claim 1 are satisfied by Blaze because Blaze discloses "A to  
7 verify trustworthiness of B's key is condition, and digital signature of A is  
8 evidence."

9 Applicants respectfully traverse. The level of trust associated with the  
10 digital signature of A (what the Office Action terms the "second evidence") does  
11 not depend on A's verifiable digital signature on B's key (what the Office Action  
12 terms the "first condition"). Rather, Blaze explicitly discloses on page 2, second  
13 column, lines 5-9:

14 a user may specify the *degree of trust* that he has in  
15 each introducer; an individual may be designated  
16 *unknown, untrusted, marginally trusted, or completely*  
17 *trusted*. Each user stores his trust information ..."  
(emphasis original).

18 Thus, Blaze discloses that the level of trust is determined by the user, which  
19 is not dependent upon what the Office Action terms as the "first condition". Gong  
20 is cited as disclosing a means for secure class resolution, loading and definition.

21 Therefore, the cited combination of Blaze and Gong does not teach or  
22 suggest the feature, "a level of trust associated with the second element is  
23 dependent upon the first condition", as recited in claim 1. Because the cited  
24 combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the cited  
25 combination fails to make out a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 1.

1 Accordingly, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 are patentable over the cited  
2 references.

3 Claim 11 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second  
4 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert  
5 that claim 11 and dependent claim 12 are patentable over the cited references for at  
6 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

7 Claim 13 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second  
8 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert  
9 that claim 13 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that  
10 claim 1 is patentable.

11 Claim 14 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second  
12 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert  
13 that claim 14 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that  
14 claim 1 is patentable.

15 Claim 15 recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a second  
16 element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert  
17 that claim 15 and dependent claim 16 are patentable over the cited references for at  
18 least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

19 Claim 17 as amended recites a similar feature regarding the level of trust of a  
20 second element being dependent upon a first condition. Thus, Applicants  
21 respectfully assert that claim 17 and dependent claims 19-21 are patentable over the  
22 cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

23 Claim 18  
24  
25

1 Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Blaze  
2 in view of Gong and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,678 (hereinafter Itoh).  
3 Applicants respectfully traverse.

4 Claim 18 depends from amended claim 17. As discussed above, Blaze and  
5 Gong do not render amended claim 17 obvious. Itoh is cited as disclosing a problem  
6 solving apparatus using state transition. However, Applicants respectfully assert that  
7 this disclosure does not overcome the deficiencies of Blaze and Gong in the rejection  
8 of claim 17. Consequently, the cited combination of Blaze, Gong and Itoh do not  
9 teach each and every element of claim 17 and, thus, fails to make out a prima facie  
10 case of obviousness. Accordingly, claim 17 is also patentable over the combination  
11 of Blaze, Gong and Itoh. As claim 18 depends from claim 17, claim 18 is patentable  
12 over Blaze, Gong and Itoh for at least the reasons that claim 17 is patentable.

13  
14 **CONCLUSION**

15 In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe all  
16 pending claims are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is  
17 respectfully requested.

18 Respectfully Submitted,

19  
20 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

21 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Lawrence E. Lycke  
23 Reg. No. 38,540  
24 (206) 315-4001 x103  
25